

The Linacre Quarterly

Volume 35 | Number 1

Article 32

February 1968

Editorial: Man Plays God

N. M. Camardese

Follow this and additional works at: <http://epublications.marquette.edu/lnq>

Recommended Citation

Camardese, N. M. (1968) "Editorial: Man Plays God," *The Linacre Quarterly*: Vol. 35 : No. 1 , Article 32.
Available at: <http://epublications.marquette.edu/lnq/vol35/iss1/32>

Editorial

MAN PLAYS GOD

And now—liberalized abortion!

Indeed, Modern Man's intellectual wisdom has become so keenly acute that he can justify enacting laws permitting him to kill innocent human beings. Defenseless beings, at that—not only innocent of all crimes!!

By what logic or reason can *homo sapiens* justify his existence? Indeed, is it not he who might have been extinguished *in utero* who might be proposing such laws!

Has Man become God? Dare he nefariously reason to have the right to extinguish a guiltless human being?—regardless what the circumstances of conception or the *possible future* of the physical or mental state of the human being in question! The less bright the possible future for the human being in question the more heinous the despicable crime of him who would dare commit murder upon such helpless, innocent being. Woe unto the man, legislator, doctor or philosopher, whoever he might be, who would defy the Christian admonition, "That which you do unto the least of my brethren, you do unto Me." Is it our goal to create a Master Race?

Too, ponder the following with me, if you please:

1. Who will define rape, and how simple an "instrument" will this be for the courts to justify "murder"?
2. What becomes of the guilt-laden "mother" unto whom the law almost imposes yet another guilt—that of "being a party to" murder.
3. Who is to be responsible for having murdered the Helen Kellers, the Beethovens, etc., etc.? (assuming Man were capable of detecting such "monstrosities")?
4. What naive body of legislators, doctors, or philosophers can predict the ultimate outcome and in the contribution to Mankind of any one human being, regardless of how "maimed or malformed" he might be, or what the circumstances of conception?
5. By comparative reasoning, why not murder all maimed people now alive?
6. Yet, why not euthanasia at age 75 for all elderly useless people?

Indeed, has modern Man progressed to a level at which he places himself comparable with God? Must he so naively, contemptuously, and smugly arrogate unto himself the Godly powers of taking innocent life?

What sordid, insipid laws which would grant these powers! I daresay, the intellectuals who would propose and abide by such regulations have become unmoored and dispossessed of qualities usually engendered in human hearts.

Then, too, perhaps this is yet another impurity (the frail; the maimed) which must be destroyed (murdered) so as to distill and purify Modern Society. If so—God help us!!

N. M. Camardese, M.D.
Norwalk, Ohio